



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

justice between this country and Great Britain and all other nations for that matter. Our Ambassador in Great Britain has had the same feeling. It is an interesting thing in our history that the diplomacy of the country has always been, as regards international friendship, especially with Great Britain, much ahead of the people. It was ahead in John Jay's time. When John Adams went to the British court he said that nothing would please him better than to be instrumental in restoring friendly relations between the two countries. The diplomacy of this country was ahead of the sentiment of the people in the time of Hamilton Fish, who was the first to suggest the Geneva arbitration, though the public were clamoring for war. We all know that during the past year American diplomacy has been at least up to the people in the demand for this permanent system of arbitration with Great Britain. So far as the Ambassador at Washington is concerned, British diplomacy has been of the same kind. Anglo-American diplomacy has reached a point, has taken a stand in favor of a permanent system of international justice, which is one of the most hopeful things in our time. Having the diplomacy with us, and having the intelligent people with us, it will not be long until, as senators come and go, we shall have a Senate that will represent both the diplomacy and the public sentiment of the country. (Applause.)

This Conference has already passed some of the stages of discussion on the subject now before us. During the sessions this year I think we may very well take up, in the first place, the defeat of the arbitration treaty, its causes and results; then the present status of the arbitration movement in its wider aspects as touching all the civilized nations; then the next measures to be adopted for the further promotion of the subject. We may wisely I think, devote one session of the Conference to the educational aspects of the subject.

Before I sit down, let me say that it is possible that we shall have to advise a treaty of a somewhat wider scope than the one which we have heretofore recommended. Many of us had hoped that the sentiment in England and America was such, and that past causes of prejudice and animosity had so ceased to operate, that when a treaty was once negotiated it would readily be ratified and become at once a part of the international law of the two countries. We have been disappointed; we have found lingering in our country and unduly represented at Washington a deep-seated prejudice out of which all the mischief has been hatched. It is possible that we may find it wise, after discussion, to recommend a treaty of wider scope. There is a class of people in this country still who will not swallow Great Britain; we shall possibly have to sugar-coat her a little for them by bringing in France, Switzerland and other countries whose parliaments have already spoken in favor of our movement. If we can succeed in agreeing to recommend a treaty of this kind, if we can get other nations into it besides Great Britain, I do not believe that any Senate two years hence would dare to refuse to ratify such a treaty. So I think the Conference may wisely discuss the question whether it will not at this time recommend a treaty of that character.

Alluding to the encouraging things of the year, I wish to say as I close that there is a congress sitting in Washington now which is the most unique, interesting and important conference in the history of the world. I refer to the International Postal Congress. When that Union

assembled in Washington, there were only three organized governments on the face of the globe out of it. Two of these have already joined; the last, China, has very likely this day entered the Union. If that be true, we have now, while this Conference is holding, the first complete international union in the history of the world, established for the promotion of a great international interest. This union is of momentous significance, because, so far as it goes, it establishes the peace of the world. The Postal Union will maintain itself hereafter in the face of all wars and rumors of wars. It may be locally disturbed, there may be hindrances to the transmission of the mails; but we have now the unique fact in history of a great union, representing all organized governments established for the perpetual promotion of an interest common to them all. That is certainly the beginning of "perpetual peace."

Everything is encouraging, everything hopeful, and I trust the Conference may set its face toward the future with greater courage and resolution than ever before.

ADDRESS OF REV. W. H. P. FAUNCE.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen.—The moral intensity of this Conference, and the limitation of time, preclude compliments, and almost force us to "salute no man by the way." Yet I cannot altogether refrain from expressing my admiration, even if it seem a little presumptuous, for our presiding officer, who during these two days has listened to an almost continuous fusillade against the honorable body of which he is one of the most honored members, and has listened with an unfailing courtesy, and unruffled urbanity, and the charity that "suffers long and is kind." The only thing that I will add about the Senate is to recall the remark of Thomas Jefferson. When asked, "What do you want of a Senate, anyway?" he said, "What do you want of a saucer with a teacup? You want it to cool your tea before you drink it." I will simply add that our national cooler has so thoroughly performed its function that there is some danger lest our national tea should be frozen before we drink it. (Laughter and applause.)

I cannot speak to represent the jurists or the lawyers to-day, but only to represent the great body of the common people who, however dimly, want to know what is true and to do what is right. For after the jurists have spoken, after the politicians have performed their manoeuvres, after the jingoes have discharged their pulmonary patriotism, after the new journalism has raved and frothed and the powers that be have displayed masterly inactivity, then a question of public policy comes before a larger jury still and a vaster constituency yet;—the great body of sober-minded American people, who are not busy with their own horoscopes, but who are toiling and hoping and praying for the spread of universal truth, for the prevalence of universal righteousness, and the reign of universal peace.

Professor Bracq has well said that the war of 1870 settled nothing. We rejoice to hear of the pacific disposition of the leaders of the French nation. And yet it is but a little time since, in the Place de la Concorde, I looked across at the monument of Strasburg draped in black and crowned with wreaths of mourning, and saw Frenchmen clenching their hands with a dangerous look in their eyes. A little later I was in the city of Geneva,

near the building where a great treaty was concluded, a great principle laid down in 1871. That which was settled in 1870 by the bayonet and the mitrailleuse was never more unsettled than now. That which was settled in 1871 by the high consent of puissant nations, that at least was settled forever. Sedan left two nations, one glutted with prey and the other biding its time. Geneva left two nations, as regards that contention, at peace forevermore. (Applause.) Those who will not learn from such an object lesson, how shall we teach them anything?

We must guard, of course, against extreme statements. We are not among those who cry, "Peace at any price." Because we are strong, because we are not a weak nation, suing for the generosity of some powerful foe, it is ours to lead unto peace. We are not among those who claim that war brings no blessings in its train. A great conflagration brings blessings: it gives the firemen admirable opportunity to display their heroism. A great epidemic gives employment to doctors. A Western cyclone furnishes inexhaustible employment for masons and carpenters. War brings blessings; they are incidental. War brings calamities; they are irremediable, inexorable and eternal. (Applause.)

Now it seems to me, as has been said this morning, we must begin right with England. Our hatred for England, if you will excuse the paradox, is the proof of our love. As Coleridge says:

"To be wroth with one we love
Doth work like madness in the brain."

There is no man with whom it is harder to keep from occasional irritation than your own brother. Two notes at opposite ends of the piano never make a discord; it is the two that are adjacent that make the grating dissonance. A quarrel in one's own family is the worst of all kinds of quarrels. Because our standard with England is so high, our demand so stringent, our irritation so easy, our feeling so easily excited,—because of that, we know that these two nations are ancestrally, congenitally and irrevocably united. (Applause.) I saw in a comic paper, a while ago, a truth spoken in jest. Uncle Sam and John Bull were standing close together and trying to hit each other, and swathing them from head to foot, were bands on which were written, "One law, one language, one religion, one blood." And they were too close together to strike.

In Westminster Abbey, side by side with the monument of Chaucer, the morning-star of English song, stands the monument of Longfellow, who united English culture and American patriotism so well that the children of his brain are in every household in the two nations. There when, a few years ago, the American Stanley swept up the aisle with Dorothy Tennant by his side, he stooped and lifted the crimson carpet that she might lay a chaplet of flowers on the grave of the great English explorer and missionary, Livingstone. And there, beside the monuments of England's kings and queens, is a memorial window to the great American who alike by his poetry and diplomacy knit those two nations yet closer,—our poet, ambassador, and orator, James Russell Lowell. (Applause.) Now a war between two such nations is monstrous and incredible; and just in proportion a lasting peace is magnificent and sublime. England has now under her control, I think, about eight million square miles, and three million more in her dependencies, about

twenty-seven per cent. of the habitable land of the globe. If the United States and England join in a compact of permanent peace, that means that more than one-half of the habitable land of the globe is brought under such a compact. Think you, if that is done, the other half will be able to hold out very long? Just because war would be so terrible is the peace so magnificent, and the vista which stretches before us to-day without end so sublime.

In the attitude of all our people we have a growing appreciation of the issue involved. You cannot interest the whole American people in any piece of picayune politics; you cannot rouse this great nation to a small issue. Only when the American people come to perceive the magnificence of the opportunity, the tremendous nature of the responsibility, the lasting consequences involved, will they rise in their might. Horace Mann said, "Where anything growing is concerned, one former is worth a dozen reformers." Now something growing is concerned here. Something is growing in this country; and if you and I can help to form the future, then our task will be magnificent. Every one of us can do something. We rejoice in the presence of the judges and lawyers and international lawyers. But it is not only for them; it is for me, for you, for these women here, whose faces are quite as eager as any others. For each of us in his own sphere may do something to spread the light and usher in the grander day.

A newspaper in New York, whose splendid powers are worthy of a better cause, has recently called this longing for international arbitration, "sloppy amicability." Let it be known whether this is sloppy amicability or is the ushering in of the kingdom of Jesus Christ on this earth. Let the voice go out from this Conference that it is no mere sentimental weakness, but courage of the highest kind, that we demand of the people. I believe a larger conception of Christianity is taking possession of our pulpits to-day, if I may allude to the work which I am doing in company with so many others. We are refusing to take as our ideal the Pilgrim in "Pilgrim's Progress," who could go through the whole world, from the City of Destruction to the Celestial City, without one earnest honest attempt to ameliorate the condition of the country through which he passed. (Applause.) When I was a member of a little church up among the hills of New Hampshire, and so small that I stood on a cricket in the pew, I well remember how we sang together,

"We are the garden walled around,
Chosen, and made peculiar ground."

and I am free to say that the wall was exceedingly high and the ground inside exceedingly peculiar. Friends, our conception of Christianity is becoming vastly larger. We are not content with an atomistic philosophy; we are not content with a mere individualism. We believe that a saint is not simply to stand on a cold pedestal and await translation into some divine art gallery, but to give himself to the amelioration of the woes of humanity, to ushering in the kingdom of the Prince of Peace among all nations. That is the sort of Christianity we represent here to-day. That is the sort of effort in which we may look for the coöperation of every one here present, and of hundreds whom every one here is able to influence. And when the day is done, we will simply say to the cowards and recreants who would not help us, in the words which a great French general used to one of his comrades, "My dear Crillon, go hang yourself! We

won a great victory at Arques, and you were not there ! ”

ADDRESS OF H. K. CARROLL, LL.D.

The present condition of the question of International Arbitration seems to me to be this: We have lost the Treaty which embodied it in good form, but we have not lost the principle. That remains. The Senate in defeating the Treaty did not defeat the principle. Indeed it did not even bring it into question. It was a particular form of application of it that was rejected. No Senator, so far as we are informed, ventured in the debate in executive session to condemn arbitration as a means of settling international questions that defy diplomacy and invite war. The Olney-Pauncefote convention was sent into that senatorial limbo of departed treaties whence no document ever returns; but the spirit of arbitration lives on and lives to prevail. We do not doubt that it will ultimately triumph, because it commends itself to human reason.

Nobody contends that the arbitrament of the sword is better than the arbitrament of reason. Men excuse wars sometimes on the ground that they are preferable to dishonor; but no sane man advances the idea that the battlefield is the only place of honor. There was a time in the memory of most of us when the practice of duelling prevailed in sections of this country. Men would settle ordinary disputes in the ordinary way; but when the cause of quarrel affected their honor, as they called it, there was but one way of settling it and that was by sword or pistol. They must fight until one or the other had fallen. The one who survived the murderous encounter held that he had vindicated his honor. Nations, in the not remote past, were accustomed to vindicate their honor in much the same way; but the argument which makes the duel appear irrational and brutish applies also, with modifications and exceptions, of course, to the fight to the death between nations.

The Senate has not disturbed, I say, the principle of arbitration, nor weakened a single argument which its friends advanced in support of the Anglo-American Treaty which so admirably embodied it. Our cause is left to us undefeated, undiminished, and uninjured. I have no doubt that all, or nearly all, of those who voted against it would admit this without hesitation.

Another thing. The defeat of the Treaty has not weakened our cause before the country. I think it quite possible that the extent and strength of the public desire for ratification of the Treaty was over-estimated. I believe the current of opinion set generally in that direction; but much of it was unintelligent and therefore weak. Everybody said arbitration was a good thing in itself, better and more humane than war; but many were not prepared to meet the specious arguments that were advanced against the particular application of it proposed in the Treaty. They were easily impressed by the utterances of Senators to the effect that it would be dangerous for the United States to ratify this Treaty. It would tie our hands and place us completely at the mercy of England, unscrupulous England, ever seeking her own aggrandizement at the expense of others and absorbed in her own selfish schemes in every quarter of the globe. All the advantages of the proposed convention were on the side of our hereditary foe. She is strong, she is cunning, she is not to be trusted.

These considerations were conclusive to many, because they lacked in their own minds sufficient arguments to overcome them. The appeal for the cause of prejudice was stronger than the appeal for the cause of reason. Others who had a more thorough understanding as to the purpose, scope and safeguards of the Treaty were not moved by the attacks against it, and estimated the stalwart Americanism of its opponents at its true value.

It is a hopeful fact that arbitration is in no sense a party question. The parties are not divided on it. Democrats voted for the Treaty and Democrats voted against it. Republicans supported it and Republicans were also found in opposition to it. Neither is it a sectional question. It is not the North on one side and the South on the other; nor is the East divided from the West. Nor is it a sectarian question. The Churches are not arrayed on opposite sides. We have therefore no political, sectional, or sectarian prejudices to overcome.

What the present situation demands, it seems to me, is a campaign of education. The question of arbitration may seem to us a very elementary question. The reasons for it crowd upon us, because we are trained in habits of thought; but it is not so with the masses. They need to have all the arguments which are convincing to us given to them again and again, so that they may be thoroughly grounded in them.

I am a member of a benevolent board which administers annually vast sums of money. It is a large body and it is a picked body of able, intelligent and consecrated men. A suit had been pending between this Board and another Board of the same Church concerning a bequest for a small amount. The decision had not been in our favor, and a request came to us from the other Society that a Board of Arbitrators be appointed, so that the matter might be settled without going to the higher court. This proposition, strange to say, did not meet with unanimous favor. There were those who held that the suit should be prosecuted to the end. When they were reminded that brother should not go to law with brother, and that arbitration was a more Christian as well as a more sensible way of settling the question at issue, the response was that arbitration was a comparatively new method, that it had its difficulties and uncertainties and that the Anglo-American Arbitration Treaty, though drawn by two eminent and accomplished statesmen and deemed well-nigh perfect, was found by the Senate to be full of dangerous errors. Let the war in the courts, they said, go on. And so it was decided, though at a subsequent meeting, on an appeal made by an able jurist, the question was sent to arbitration.

I mention this instance to show that the public need a larger and more liberal education in the elementary principles of arbitration.

I think the present situation requires that we go a step further and show how admirably the principles of arbitration are applied in the rejected Treaty. We can hold it up as a model, not perhaps as a perfect model, for it has not been tried and experience might show that it has defects; but we can treat it as a working model, use it as a sort of object lesson, showing how the best English and American statesmanship approach the problem, how simple the proposed machinery is, and how every critical point is safeguarded. In this connection we can quote from the Senators who supported it, and reply to the arguments of those who opposed it.